

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the claims to simply overcome the objections. Claims 1 and 27 have been amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for accepting the drawings as filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 10-11, 27-28, 30, and 34-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlesworth et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,990,448) in view of Baker et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,092,044). Claims 5 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlesworth et al. in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Hashimoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,632,002). Claims 6-7, 9, 17-18, 32, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlesworth et al. in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Morrison (U.S. Pat. No. 5,425,128). Claims 8 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlesworth et al. in view of Baker et al., further in view of Morrison, and yet further in view of Hashimoto et al. Claims 12 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlesworth et al. in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Korall et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,996,531). Claims 13-16, 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlesworth et al. in

view of Baker et al., and further in view of Young et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,959). Claims 19-22, 29, 42, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlesworth et al. in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Sabourin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,073,099). Claims 23-24, 29, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlesworth et al. in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Hirayama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,708,150). Claims 25-26, 29, and 45-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlesworth et al. in view of Baker et al., and further in view of Goronzy (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0011805). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' claims are directed to systems and methods for developing "sounds like" pairs for a voice tagging lexicon. The voice tagging lexicon is used by a speech recognition engine to match speech input with a corresponding tag. The "sounds like" pairs include alphanumeric characters associated with normalized text.

Charlesworth et al. disclose a system for using speech recognition to annotate a data file which is to be stored in a database. (Abstract) At best, Charlesworth et al. disclose converting typed data or a voice signal to phoneme and word lattice annotation data and appending the phoneme and word lattice annotation data to the data file. (Col. 10, Lines 2-8, 39-42) The phoneme and the word lattice annotation data can then be used to retrieve the corresponding data file via a voice query. (Col. 11, lines 5-10) Applicants can find no mention in Charlesworth et al. of normalized text data being associated with the voice signal or the typed signal to generate a "sounds like" pair. Applicants can find no mention in Charlesworth et al. of updating a lexicon with the "sounds like" pair. Applicants can find no mention in Charlesworth et al. of tagging a

data file using the "sounds like" pair. Applicants can find no mention in Charlesworth et al. of normalized text being displayed by a voice tag editor.

Baker et al. disclose a method of adding a word to a speech recognition vocabulary. (Abstract) The word is added by receiving a spelling and an utterance of the word and creating a net of possible phonetic pronunciations of the word. (Col. 2, lines 14-16) The word is added to the speech recognition vocabulary using the spelling and a best-matching pronunciation. The "sounds like" pairs in Baker et al. includes the word (alphanumeric characters) and the pronunciation (phonetics). Applicants can find no mention in Baker et al. of a "sounds like" pair including normalized text and the alphanumeric characters. Applicants can find no mention in Baker et al. of a text parser operable to generate normalized text corresponding to the alphanumeric characters. Applicants can find no mention in Baker et al. of normalized text being displayed by a voice tag editor.

Therefore, at a minimum, neither Charlesworth et al. nor Baker et al. show, teach, or suggest associating the normalized text with the corresponding alphanumeric characters thereby developing a desired voice tag "sounds like" pair. Further at a minimum, neither Charlesworth et al. nor Baker et al. show, teach, or suggest normalized text being displayed by a voice tag editor. It would not be obvious to modify Charlesworth et al. or Baker et al. to teach the above mentioned deficiencies. Therefore, Charlesworth et al. and Baker et al. if combined, do not show, teach, or suggest the elements of at least claims 1 and 27.

Without acceding to the correctness of the Examiner's remarks thereover, as Claims 2-26 and 28-46 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1

and 27, Claims 2-26 and 28-46 should be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct 4, 2006

By:



Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS:LNK:mhe